

REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action has been reviewed.

The allowance of Claim 1 is noted.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2, 3, 5, 7 and 8 "under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting". The Examiner has also rejected Claims 2, 3, and 5-7 "under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kain. The Examiner has then rejected Claims 2-7 "under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jacobs (5,853,362)." The Examiner has then rejected Claim 8 "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kain as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Ritchie et al (6,132,366)" and has rejected Claim 8 again, "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Ritchie et al (6,132,366)." These rejections are traversed.

With regard to the Examiner's rejection on double patenting, this rejection is deemed no longer applicable in view of the terminal disclaimer submitted herewith.

The Examiner's rejections based upon the prior art are deemed overcome by the amendments herein. Note that Claim 2 has now been expanded to include the subject matter of Claims 4, 5 and 8 and that Claims 3 through 8 have been canceled.

Although there are similarities between the prior art and applicant's invention as now claimed, there is no teaching for the combination proposed by the Examiner. Of particular importance are the first end with the enlarged head with two

lobes and a groove and with the handle at the other end and with an intermediate flange of an enlarged diameter. Although the various pieces of prior art disclose various features, no single reference discloses the combination and there is nothing in the prior art for the combination proposed by the Examiner. Further, there is no teaching of the annular flange of an enlarged diameter as presently claimed.

It would appear that the Examiner has merely gleaned miscellaneous features in the prior art and has attempted to combine them without a teaching for their combination. The only teaching is in applicant's disclosure which, by definition, is not prior art. But even if there were a teaching for the combination, the resulting structure would still fail to anticipate applicant's invention for the reasons set forth herein above.

If the Examiner does not feel that this amendment places the application in condition for allowance, he is requested to enter the amendment for purposes of appeal.